

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is a complete and timely response to the Office action of March 01, 2007. The applicant presents arguments concerning the allowability of claims 1-11 as filed and 5 introduces new independent claim 34 and claims 35-42 dependent thereon. No new material has been introduced. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

**1. Background**

Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taiwanese Publication No. 485283 to Xie et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5317309 to 10 Vercellotti et al. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xie in view of Vercellotti and U.S. Patent 6686830 to Schirtzer. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xie in view of Vercellotti and U.S. Patent No. 6944425 to Fallenstein.

Claims 4-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would 15 be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**2. Claim rejections**

The page 2 of the Xie reference defines a problem of a computer being unable to 20 differentiate whether or not a user is still present at the computer and will cause the display device to enter a power-savings mode unless the computer receives user input. Xie presents one solution to this problem by providing “a type of display device equipped with an end-user signal emitter device that emits a signal at the work station to detect user 25 status and determine if the display device should enter the pre-determined power saving mode”.

Paraphrased, Xie discloses a way of preventing the display from entering a power savings if the signal emitter device remains at the work station.

On the other hand, Vercellotti disclosure is directed towards identification. “The present invention may be used for a number of applications in which an identification 30 is required at a fixed position as the tag enters a given area and where the

identification and location of the tag is desired to be known when the tag is in a much wider varying area.” (Col.3, lines 15-20).

The Examiner has stated that it is obvious to combine Vercellotti with Xie to anticipate the present application “to cut costs and improve reliability in a secure system.”

As is a matter of record, the present application was subjected to a restriction requirement on 12/06/2006. On Page 2 of the Election requirement, the Examiner states: **“In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are intended to perform different functions. Invention 1 deals with power control in a networked system while Invention 11 deals with access control to a remote device in a network. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.”**

Applicant elected Invention 1.

At least because the entire invention must be considered when determining obviousness or non-obvious matters and the Election remarks of the Examiner, the applicant asserts that the power control invention of Xie and the security invention of Vercellotti should be considered as performing different functions, not encompassing overlapping subject matter, and are not obvious variants of each other.

This being the case, the applicant is unable to understand why the two cited arts should in an effort to anticipate the present claims as suggested by the Examiner. Nowhere does Xie teach a secure system. The applicant is unable to locate anything where Vercellotti’s system is used to control power. With all due respect to the Examiner’s suggested motivation, there is no reasonable reason to make Xie’s device a secure system, in fact to modify Xie as suggested would add costs and complications to Xie’s device. The two disclosures are different subject matter and an average person skilled in the art would not find any reason to combine the two systems.

It is additionally noted that Xie’s disclosure corresponds to powering down a display device, not a processing module of the computer system as is claimed and clearly indicated in the present disclosure. This difference is not trivial as also would be apparent to one skilled in the art.

Appl. No. 10/708,903  
Amdt. dated May 23, 2007  
Reply to Office action of March 01, 2007

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the applicant asserts that the present claims represent a new and useful device and respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1-11.

5     **3. New claims**

Applicant has chosen to introduce new independent claim 34 and claims 35-42 dependent thereon. No new material has been introduced. Specific support for claims 34 and 35 can be found at least in paragraphs [0028]-[0030] as published. Support for the remaining new claims can be found at least in claims 1-11 as filed.

10

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15     Sincerely yours,



Date:       05/23/2007      

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
20     Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in  
25     D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)